



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Some useful hints are given on the rhetorical construction of the speech itself, the reason why the defendant begins by discrediting his adversaries, etc. Is the speech as it now stands, the speech which Apuleius actually made in court? I agree with Marchesi in believing that it probably is. The style is very Apuleian, some of his allusions must have been over the heads of the court. But *omne ignotum pro magnifico*. Apuleius was too good a rhetorician not to appreciate the full value of illustrating that famous phrase in a case like this. I can conceive of no better method of concealing the really weak points in his defence than just the one which he pursued.

Professor Marchesi also discusses the *clausula* of Apuleius as illustrated in this speech and gives a number of interesting examples. He does not agree with the English editors in believing that F is the one ultimate source of our text. He thinks that B has an independent value, and one of the valuable features of his book is the section in which he gives the variants of that ms.

Perhaps the most interesting part of his Introduction is that in which he reviews and characterizes the religious situation. One wonders whether the world has ever seen such a state of mind as that which prevailed throughout the Roman Empire in the second century A. D. Nothing could be better than his summary of the matter on p. 40:

Era lo sfacelo della potenza e della cultura pagana, era la grandezza occidentale che si sfiniava e si dissipava attraverso le moltitudini trionfanti. L'Oriente imbarbarito si riversava coi suoi apostoli, coi suoi maghi, coi suoi martiri nel cuore dell'impero e ne sconvolgeva i battiti sereni, suscitando un fermento mortale. Dalla Siria, dall'Egitto, dalla Palestina, dai territori degli antichi Fenici debellati e assoggettati, veniva l'enorme, l'irreparabile invasione a cui Roma non poteva opporre più nè consoli nè imperatori; era invasione di fantasmi, di spiritati, di trasognati; erano schiavi che trascinavano i liberi, erano poveri che trascinavano i ricchi nelle stesse paure e nei medesimi sacrifici. C'eran tutti insomma per la prima volta nella storia, sospinti da una potenza invisibile contro tutte le potenze reali. L'Asia riconquistava l'Europa nel nome di Dio.

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

---

Apulei *Apologia* . . . With Introduction and Commentary by  
H. E. BUTLER and A. S. OWEN. Oxford, at the Clarendon  
Press, 1914. Pp. LXVI+95+208.

To my thinking this is by far the best edition which we have ever had of Apuleius' famous defence of himself against the

charge of using magic to win to wife a susceptible widow some twenty years his senior.

In the Introduction and Commentary, Mr. Owen is responsible for all matters of style and language and for most of the notes on magic; the remaining topics are in the hands of Mr. Butler. The Introduction which consists of 66 pp. deals with the life and works of Apuleius, the mss. of the *Apologia* and *Florida* and the style of the *Apology*. The text might be defined as a standardized version of the one published by Rudolf Helm (Teubner, 1910). The basis, therefore, is F. Mr. Butler does not believe that B is of any great value as an independent authority.

Mr. Owen's discussion of the style of the *Apology* is comparatively brief (22 pp.) and there is no attempt either here or in the Notes to give an exhaustive list of examples and authorities. But it is much more to the point and much more illuminating than any other discussion of the style of Apuleius which I have seen. Realizing, as all of us now do, that what Apuleius writes is a variety of rhetoric, not a variety of Latinity, Mr. Owen shows unusual knowledge and taste in the choice and development of the topics best calculated to illustrate the Asian style as it appears in this strange age.

The Commentary is clear and sufficient and does not claim to be 'concise'. I am rather weary of commentaries which claim to be 'concise' and I am, also, rather suspicious of them, especially of those which substitute paraphrases for explanation. Also, the Commentary is refreshingly honest. For example, the editors see no very definite meaning in *digitos aperuisse*, etc., in sec. 89. Well, who does?

Such translations as one finds here are particularly good. *Turbabat* (83), for instance, = 'ran amuck', could not be bettered. Such phrases as *montes auri* (20) and *tanti . . . estis quantum habetis* (23) are illustrated by two or three parallels. I, myself, no doubt would have given a larger number as well as the appropriate references to Otto and Sutphen. But criticism of this sort has nothing to do with the real value of the book, and is of no great consequence for any purpose. My Commentary on Tibullus was called too long by some, too condensed by others; some admired the feature of inserting modern echoes of the poet, others—for example, Professor Thomas—appeared to have been irritated by them, etc. What is an editor to do in the face of such criticism? Except to do as he thinks best.

The book concludes with a useful bibliography and excellent grammatical and general indices.

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.